REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 12-18 have been amended. No new matter has been presented.

The specification is objected to for failure to provide proper antecedent basis for several terms. Applicants traverse this objection as follows.

The Examiner asserts that the term "programmed logic circuitry" is not supported or described in the specification and that such term has no antecedent basis. As will be appreciated by persons skilled in the art, in the illustrative implementations, the processing system/circuitry described herein including CPU CORE 42 is "programmed" to control the game process in accordance with the "logic" set forth in the exemplary flowcharts of Figures 22-32. One of ordinary skill in the art will therefore recognize that a processing system including a CPU when executing instructions in accordance with one of more flowchart blocks operates as "programmed logic circuitry" to perform the operations defined by the flowchart blocks. Thus, Applicant submits that the claimed programmed logic circuitry, as understood by one skilled in the art, was readily disclosed and supported in the specification as originally submitted.

Further, the claimed "detector" is represented by at least elements 42, S5, S7, S131, S133, S135, S137, S143, S145, S161, S163, S189, S211, S213 and S227 of the figures of this application, which makes it clear that this element includes a hardware component.

The claimed controllers are represented by at least elements 42, 50, 52, 60, S181, S183, S241 and S243 of the figures of this application, which makes it clear that this element includes a hardware component. Likewise, the claimed setter is represented by at least elements 42, S181, S183, S241 and S243.

Finally, the claimed storage medium can be seen as a hardware component in Fig. 2.

In light of the foregoing, applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cutler, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0188329. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4, 12-18 have been amended to clarify that, if and when it is determined that a predetermined input such as a click operation or a slide operation of the touch pen within a selection area corresponding to a window being displayed on the first display area or to a forefront window out of a plurality of windows being displayed in an overlapping manner on the first display area, a window corresponding to the selection area is displayed on the second display area. Applicants submit that Cutler fails to teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner asserts that Cutler's Fig. 3, screen 56k corresponds to the claimed first display area and that Cutler's Fig. 7, the screen area where the navigation box is located, corresponds to the claimed second display area. However, Cutler does not teach that if an input to the first area (the screen 56k in Fig. 3) is detected, a window corresponding to the selected area is displayed on the second display area (Cutler's Fig. 7).

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, or deem that any formalities need to be addressed prior to allowance,

the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Deborah S. Gladstein/
Deborah S. Gladstein
Reg. No. 43,636

DSG:nd
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

1656841